

MINUTES OF THE DELIBERATIVE SESSION
ANNUAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
KINGSTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE
FEBRUARY 9, 2022

The Meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM by Moderator Robert Dezmelyk, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance and the National Anthem played by 7th Grade student Gabe Edelman on his Tenor Saxophone. The meeting took place at the Sanborn Regional High School Auditorium at 17 Danville Road in Kingston, New Hampshire.

The Moderator introduced himself, saying he is glad to be doing this in the School District now and he thanked previous Moderators for their many years of service before him. He introduced the panel as follows: District Clerk, Phyllis Kennedy, Business Administrator, Matthew Angell, Legal Counsel, James O'Shaughnessy, Superintendent, Thomas Ambrose, School Board members, Jamie Fitzpatrick, Moira Bashaw, Tammy Mahoney, Vice Chair Jim Baker, Chair, Dawn Dutton, Heather Ingham, and Peter Broderick. Budget Committee Members followed: Chair, Jim McCarthy, Vice Chair Vanessa Matias, Cheryl Gannon, Rick Edelman, Mary Cyr, Annie Collyer, and Christine Kuzmitski is excused tonight.

The Moderator said our job tonight as voters, is to discuss and deliberate over and theoretically at least, if necessary, make amendments to the articles on the warrant in the first phase of our Deliberative. In the second phase of the meeting, we will vote on those articles at the polling places in Newton and Kingston on Tuesday, March 8th. So, I will be reading the Warrant in a moment and obviously, this is the time for questions and discussion about the Articles. There will be presentations from the School Board and Budget Committee on their aspects of it and then at the end we will wrap up. On voting day, March 8th, the locations of the polling places are the Swasey Gym for Kingston Voters, which is open from 8 AM to 8 PM and at for Newton voters at 8D Merrimac Road (Fire Rescue Station) also open from 8 AM to 8 PM.

Moderator read the 2022 Warrant introduction explaining that each of the articles are up for discussion and debate (except for **Article 1-To *elect the following school district officers***) and may be amended subject to some limitations, except that warrant articles whose wording is prescribed by law shall not be amended. Warrant articles that are amended, shall be placed on the official ballot for a final vote on the main motion and no warrant shall be amended to eliminate the subject matter of the article or of course we cannot add subject matter that was not warranted in the warrant.

Moderator read Article 2-General Acceptance of Reports

Article 2. Shall the reports of school district agents, auditors, committees, or officers chosen be accepted and placed on file?

Moderator asked if there were questions or discussion on Article 2. Seeing none, Moderator announced that Article 2 will be on the Ballot.

Moderator read Article 3-Operating Budget

Article 3-Operating Budget -*Shall the Sanborn Regional School District raise and appropriate as an operating budget, not including appropriations by special warrant articles and other appropriations voted separately, the amounts set forth on the budget posted with the warrant, or as amended by vote at the first session, for the purposes set forth therein, totaling Thirty-seven Million, One hundred and Seventy-nine Thousand, Four Hundred and Sixty-three Dollars (\$37,179,463)? Should this article be defeated, the default budget shall be Thirty-seven Million, Two Hundred and Thirty-two Thousand, Six Hundred and Thirty-five Dollars (\$37,232,635), the same as last year with certain adjustments required by previous action of the Sanborn Regional School District or by law; or the governing body may hold one special meeting, in accordance with RSA 40:13, X and XVI, to take up the issue of a revised operating budget only. (This warrant article does not include appropriations in any other warrant article.)*

Recommended by the Budget Committee In Favor: 8 Opposed: 0

Recommended by the Sanborn Regional School Board In Favor: 6 Opposed: 1

Operating Budget Estimated Tax Impact: Kingston: \$ 1.95 /\$1,000 Newton: \$ 2.11/\$1,000

Default Budget Estimated Tax Impact Kingston: \$ 1.98 /\$1,000 Newton: \$ 2.15 /\$1,000

Moderator Dezmelyk turned the meeting over to Budget Committee member Ms. Gannon who will present the Budget Committee's Proposed Operating Budget for the fiscal year 2022-23. To view the slide presentation, [please click here.](#)

Moira Bashaw, the School Board representative to the Budget Committee reviewed the Default Budget details.

Ms. Gannon completed the presentation.

The Moderator asked for comments from the School Board.

Jamie Fitzpatrick (School Board member)-The Board has asked me to comment on the Warrant Articles. They're all financial in nature and I'm the Chair of the Finance Committee, so I have a few comments on each of them. We just heard the details of the finances from the Budget Committee, so I won't go through those. The key takeaways really are that the increases are driven by the voter approved staff contracts, also health care cost increases, premium increases, and special education increases. Those are the main drivers. When we talk about the Operating Budget it is \$53,172 less than the Default Budget it means that if the Operating Budget is defeated at the polls, then the Default Budget, the budget that will become the ongoing Operating Budget would be

\$53,172 dollars more. I'd also point out we mentioned in the reserves, a number of different reserves, the total reserves are \$ 915, 000 which represent about 2.5% of the budget and in addition, there's a withheld on expended funds of \$545, 000 so there's a total of 1 million 460, so I just thought it was important to note that because we get to the reserve discussions at the back end of the Warrants. I'll come back to those numbers with some comments. Thank you.

The Moderator asked if anyone from the public has any questions or discussion.

Pam Brown (Kingston)- I just had a quick question, so the folks at home would know this. We have some important unmet needs here such as the track resurfacing. Couldn't we use the Capital Reserve Funds if the board approved that to fund some of these projects? Thank you.

(Answer) -Mr. Angell (Business Administrator)-Yes, we could. We could even use current year appropriation if the School Board approves it.

Michael Gannon (Kingston)-Please repeat the last question?

Moderator-Could the funds from the Capital Reserve be used for things like resurfacing the track?

Michael Gannon (Kingston)-I don't fully understand why that is listed; it is not in the Operating Budget. Why that specifically with the running track, which I would like to comment on as well.

I would be in favor of finding some way of getting that money into the budget in some fashion. You are the experts on that. Reason being, is that track is used not only by the community, perhaps some of you use it yourselves, but we have the athletic teams, not only track or Cross Country, but other teams have also used it as well. I would also keep in mind that we have a high school and a middle school gym class that, weather permitting, use that part of the facility as well. So, it gets used quite a bit by a lot of people. The problem that I would foresee, and this has happened down in Timberlane because we have seen it there and as I recall last year, Timberlane had to use our track because theirs had deteriorated so much, they couldn't use it. Before things get too bad, we invest a little money up front as opposed to big money later on. So, I would ask everyone to take a wise second look at that. Thank you.

The Moderator asked if anyone from the School Board or Budget Committee would like to answer.

(Answer)-Superintendent Ambrose- Thank you, I do want to make sure that everyone understands that in my Superintendent's Proposed Budget, there were three items that were included in that presentation that have been lovingly called Tom's big three at this point; one is the track, one is the auditorium, and the other one is the wireless

infrastructure. It is our belief that the track actually should get done at the conclusion of this school year prior to the adoption of this budget and that it should be paid for out of either the year-end funds or the capital reserve funds that Pam Brown talked about because I actually don't think that we should wait until the end of next year Mr. Gannon. I think that we should do it now and so we the Board have agreed to have a conversation and get quotes about those things and make a decision toward the end of the school year. So, I would say that those three things are on the table for discussion sooner than later but they have not been decided yet formally by the Board. We are just in the research phase. Did I summarize that correctly, Madame Chair? Yes, Thank you.

The Moderator asked if there were any other questions or comments regarding this article? Seeing there are none, Article 3 will go on the Ballot as presented.

Ms. Mahoney (School Board member) said Mr. Moderator, I make a Motion to restrict reconsideration of Article 3, seconded by Mr. Baker.

(The Moderator explains for those not familiar with this process, that as a deliberative body, you the voters, have the ability to discuss and make amendments about these warrant articles and unless you choose to do so, you have the right to do that throughout the evening. In other words, you could theoretically come back and say, wait a minute, we want to go back again and rethink a warrant article we went through before. You also have the ability to decide not to do that and that's one of the few decisions you can make as a group of voters. That's a kind of one-way decision that once you have decided you're not going to come back to an article during the course of the evening, that's it. You can't reverse that decision, but it is a common decision to make because that lets everyone move forward without any issue in their heads of someone saying, let's go back to an article and revisit it. So, that's the Motion; it is called a Motion to Restrict Reconsideration and it will therefore just end up on the ballot to be voted at on election day.)

Moderator asked if there is any discussion or questions on that from the voters? Seeing none, we are going to have a voice vote. All in favor, say "aye", all opposed? The "ayes" carry it, so reconsideration has been restricted for Article 3.

The Moderator read Article 4.

Article 4-Support Staff Collective Bargaining Agreement - Shall the Sanborn Regional School District approve the cost items included in the collective bargaining agreement for support staff reached between the School Board and the Sanborn Regional Education Association which calls for the following increases in salaries and benefits at current staffing levels over the amount paid in the prior fiscal year:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Estimated Increases</u>
1) 2022-2023	\$ 159,890
2) 2023-2024	\$ 96,809
3) 2024-2025	\$ 94,544

and further, to raise and appropriate the sum of One Hundred and Fifty-nine Thousand, Eight Hundred and Ninety Dollars (\$159,890) for the 2022-23 fiscal year, such sum representing the additional costs attributable to the increase in salaries and benefits required by the new agreement over those of the appropriation at the current staffing levels?

Recommended by the Budget Committee In Favor: 8 Opposed 0

Recommended by the Sanborn Regional School Board In Favor: 7 Opposed: 0

Estimated Tax Impact Kingston: \$0.10 /\$1,000 Newton: \$0.11 /\$1,000

The Moderator recognized Mr. Fitzpatrick who will speak to this Article 4.

Mr. Fitzpatrick (School Board member)- so this agreement covers our paraprofessionals, speech therapists, secretarial staff over a three-year term. All parties came to the table knowing that the district had a need to reset the pay matrix for support staff. Given the current economic conditions, the district has been unable to fill open positions particularly this has led to our being unable to fully implement the intended intervention programs. Changing an existing pay matrix is not an easy task. All parties work together to make it happen; he administration as well as the collective bargaining agreement. No parties got what they wanted, all they wanted anyways, and we did achieve what the district needed and that was resetting it. So, we've gone from 13 steps to 10 steps. We reset the entry pay levels to help us attract new employees. We changed the differentials between the steps. We reset how we handle off step staff. We increased the employee contribution to health care to help fund these changes so that went from a 12 contribution to a 14 contribution and we increased the base pay by 2 for years 2 and 3. None of these were easy tasks to achieve for the negotiating committee, but all of us kept the focus on the district needs to find a way to get there and we work together to achieve that, so all sides worked together to provide the district with an agreement that allows the district to meet its staffing and educational needs as well as protecting the interests of our taxpayers and our staff. So, I strongly urge the voters to support this agreement. Thank you.

The Moderator asked for questions or discussion on Article 4 from the panel and then from the public.

Cheryl Gannon (Kingston)-Can you explain why the first year of this contract is so significantly higher than the next two years?

(Answer) -Mr. Angell (Business Administrator)- The first-year salary schedule was completely reset and then also moving a lot of the people onto that salary schedule, so it's completely redoing the pay matrix for years two and three; it's just a straight two percent change to that salary schedule, so the impact occurs only in the first year for that major change.

Pam Brown (Kingston)- I heard the 2% base pay increase mentioned, but did you negotiate a Cost-Of-Living Adjustment (COLA) because inflation has been pretty bad this year and if so, how much?

(Answer)-Mr. Fitzpatrick (School Board member)- the COLA was the two percent in the out years; the resetting of the matrix in year one was to address the reality of our pay levels not being sufficient in the marketplace in order to attract talent, so it was a combination of working with these staff that exist today with the different levels of seniority in that staff and coming up with a matrix that gave us a much better starting position. So, the starting position actually went from 1309 to 15 and change for an opening position at the lowest level for the paraprofessionals for example. So, that was addressed in the resetting of the matrix in the resetting of the initial opening wage.

The Moderator asked for further questions or discussion on Article 4. Seeing none, Article 4 will be places on the ballot as written.

Mr. Broderick (School Board member)- said Mr. Moderator, I make a Motion to restrict reconsideration of Article 4, seconded by Ms. Ingham.

The Moderator said this is a Motion to restrict reconsideration of Article 4. Do we have any comments or discussion on the Motion? All in favor, say “aye”, opposed? The “ayes” carry, so there will be no reconsideration of Article 4.

The Moderator read Article 5.

Article 5. Special Meeting – Support Staff Collective Bargaining Agreement

Shall the Sanborn Regional School District if Article 4 is defeated, authorize the governing body to call one special meeting, at its option, to address Article 4 cost items only?

Recommended by the Sanborn Regional School Board In Favor: 7 Opposed: 0

Jamie Fitzpatrick (School Board member)- so this is basically saying that this article will allow though won't require that the board can set up a meeting to renegotiate the monetary aspects of the contract if warrant

article 4 is defeated at the polls. The wording and the terms and conditions stay the same, but the dollar values associated with the monies identified in article 4 could be renegotiated. Basically, it's a fallback position to provide a possible option for proceeding if the contract fails at the polls.

The Moderator asked for any further questions from the Board or from the voters on Article 5? Seeing none, Article 5 will go on the ballot as presented.

Moderator read Article 6.

Article 6- Unanticipated Utility Costs Expendable Trust Fund

Article 6 - Shall the Sanborn Regional School District vote to establish an Unanticipated Utility Costs Expendable Trust Fund under RSA 198:20-c for the purpose of funding unanticipated utility costs and to raise and appropriate up to Seventy-five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000) to be placed in the fund, such sum to come from June 30 fund balance available for transfer on July 1, with no additional amounts to be raised from taxation (i.e., the funds will not lapse to the general fund to offset taxes); and further to name the School Board as agents to expend from this fund.

Recommended by the Budget Committee *In Favor: 8 Opposed: 0*

Recommended by the Sanborn Regional School Board *In Favor: 7 Opposed: 0*

Estimated Tax Impact *Kingston: \$0.00 /\$1,000* *Newton: \$0.00 /\$1,000*

The Moderator recognized Mr. Fitzpatrick who will address Article 6.

Jamie Fitzpatrick (School Board member)- So, this is trying to address the realities of inflation. This is talking about the utility side of the house. So just some quick numbers: West Texas crude oil as of yesterday was \$89.36 cents a barrel. On 12- 31- 20, it was \$48.52 so oil's gone up 84 % in a little bit more than a year. Electricity, if you look at that comparison, a couple different ways to measure electricity kilowatt hour. December 21 to December 20 is up 11%. The cost of pipe gas delivered per therm is up 19. So, these are significant cost increases. Those types of cost increases aren't fully factored into the budget. We don't know what's going to happen with oil prices or utility prices. We do have some rate changes that have happened but there's also some adjustments in the outline, so we don't really know. We thought it would be prudent to put this into a trust fund for these particular items; for oil, electricity, in order to be able to balance out needs and to be able to tap into these funds should this inflation get us to a point where we don't have enough funds, or else we would have to tap other line items in the budget to be able to cover those costs because you can't have lights out and you can't have no heat so that's why we set it up in the warrant article. You'll see that it's zero tax impact. The reason that

it's a zero-tax impact listed on the article is the funding would come from unexpended funds and those have already been taxed and paid for. So, the balance has already been taxed if the funds were instead returned to the taxpayers, then there would be instead of going to this then there would be a decrease for the taxpayers of four and a half to six cents depending on whether you're Kingston or Newton which comes out to about \$13.50 to \$18 per 300K house.

The Moderator asked for any questions or discussion on Article 6?

Michael Gannon (Kingston)- I just want to clarify in my mind what you were saying about the funding for this or are you looking to take unspent monies to fund this \$75, 000? That that's the first priority and then you're saying that if there is no leftover money at the end of the year that an article would be presented to the community?

(Answer) Jamie Fitzpatrick (School Board member)- the way that we've been funding our warrant articles to increase the reserves is that funding is coming out of unexpected funds. So, we have unexpended funds, generally speaking, and I think that Ms. Gannon showed that in the right the prior data set. They were averaging a million in the last couple years, skewed a little bit high because of COVID into two million range but there's generally speaking, going to be some unexpended funds, and what we're saying is this money to fund these would come out of those unexpected unexpended funds, as there are warrant articles, these would be the first things that the unexpended funds would be dedicated to.

Cheryl Gannon (Kingston)- the article says up to \$75, 000. How do you decide how much money to put into that fund and then just a second question, can you explain what it means that the funds will not lapse to the general fund to offset taxes?

(Answer)- Matt Angell-Business Administrator- so the amount of money that's going to be in there is an estimation above what we've anticipated in the in the operating budget and so, the warrant article is really meant to be a way to help smooth out the tax rate so if we are able to deal with the increases within the operating budget, then the money rolls over to the next following year without further taxation of the taxpayers and can be used for that particular purpose in the following year. So, when it means by non-lapsing, it just means that it just carries over and can be spent without a deadline. Deciding on the \$75,000, when you look at heating oil, electricity and propane and looking at the fluctuation of the rates and when you're building the budget you've got to determine like an estimated rate and so I try to use an inflated rate that's a reasonably inflated rate for like heating oil and electricity, but this brings it up to a much higher balance so right now I'm buying heating oil at \$2.19 cents a gallon. I think I made the budget at \$2.50 but this could cover up to a \$3 per gallon increase for heating oil.

(Answer) Jamie Fitzpatrick (School Board member)- I think what Ms. Gannon is asking is it says up to \$75,000 at the end of the period and the intent is if this article is approved, that we would fully fund it to the \$75,000 presuming that there's at least \$25,000 available at the end of the year.

Superintendent Ambrose- Our attorney, Mr. O'Shaughnessy just made a point that a lot of these warrant articles that are written for this purpose are approved by the Department of Revenue (DRA) so that language allows us to do that; put money that is left in the account into the account.

The Moderator asked for any other questions or discussion on Article 6? Seeing none, Article 6 shall be on the ballot as presented.

Mr. Broderick (School Board member)- said, Mr. Moderator, I make a Motion to restrict reconsideration of Article 6, seconded by Ms. Ingham.

The Moderator said there has been a Motion to restrict reconsideration of Article 6, all in favor say "aye", opposed? The "ayes" carry so it will not be reconsidered.

Ms. Dutton (School Board Chair)- asked the Moderator if we restricted reconsideration of Article 5? Moderator confirmed that we did not.

Ms. Mahoney (School Board member)- Mr. Moderator, I make a Motion to restrict reconsideration of Article 5, seconded by Ms. Ingham.

The Moderator asked if there was any further discussion? All in favor, "Aye, opposed? The "aye's carry and Article 5 (regarding the Special Meeting) will not be reconsidered.

Moderator read Article 7.

Article 7- Device Protection Plan Revolving Fund

Shall the Sanborn Regional School District vote to establish a Student Device Revolving Fund in accordance with RSA 194:3-c for the purpose of supporting, maintaining, and replacing student electronic devices. The money received from technology protection plan dues shall be deposited into the fund and shall be allowed to accumulate from year to year and shall not be considered part of the District's general fund balance. Withdrawal and disbursement of said funds shall be on a monthly basis for the purposes for which the fund was created. (Majority vote required).

Recommended by the Budget Committee In Favor: 8 Opposed: 0

Recommended by the Sanborn Regional School Board In Favor: 7 Opposed: 0

Estimated Tax Impact Kingston: \$0.00 /\$1,000 Newton: \$0.00 /\$1,000

Jamie Fitzpatrick (School Board member)- So, in plain terms this is a car insurance plan for electronic devices or if you prefer, an extended warranty. Parents or guardians can choose to join or not join the plan at their discretion. For those who join, any damage to the device is paid by the plan no deductions. Anybody that doesn't join, any damage the device is paid by the parent or the guardian or the child, I suppose if they make the child pay. So really, it's parents who have to make the determination if little Jimmy or little Susie are prone to break things, it might be wise to take out the insurance plan. If they're not, it might not be right, but it's completely up to the parents. There's no obligation and there's no mandated fee. It is an insurance plan that you can choose to participate in or not.

The Moderator asked for other questions or discussion.

John Beebe (Kingston)-Good evening. This is the first time I have heard of this plan which I think is a good plan. I guess my question is (two questions), one is, seeing how this is a new plan, do we have any historical tracking of other schools and how successful the plan was?

(Answer)-Superintendent Ambrose- Yes, this was modeled after a successful plan at the Timberlane School District.

John Beebe (Kingston)-Number two. How successful were they in chasing down the individuals or parents who destroyed equipment or did not take care of it and were unable to recover those funds?

(Answer)-Superintendent Ambrose- Thank you for asking. It is important to note that our Tech Department does a fantastic job with that already. The point of this program is that you would actually pay the fee at the beginning before damage and then once the device is damaged, the plan would cover the repair costs. Currently our district is just servicing the computers without any kind of plans, so this is really a move in a positive direction. I don't know the answer personally of how Timberlane did with that, but I know that our district and our team and I am looking at Mr. Parks in the back, our Director of Tech who does a fantastic job following up with students and making sure that devices are taken care of.

John Beebe (Kingston)- So just to be clear, so I understand it and everyone else does as well and I'm not judging the individual's ability to manage the tech department in any way. So, for the parents who are willing to fund for their children that's great and for the parents who are unwilling to fund is that funded through the budget?

(Answer)- Matt Angell-Business Administrator- If the parents don't participate in the program, they are responsible for 100% of the damages to the machine as they are right

now. If say for example a student smashes a screen and a screen cost \$100 the parent is going to pay \$100. However, if the parent opts into the program before the damage and say the insurance amount is like \$40, they're only out of pocket \$40 and the fund would pay for the damage to the screen.

John Beebe (Kingston)- So, in essence, it is definitely improvement over what we have today because we don't have that protection and we give people the opportunity to minimize damage or loss correct.

(Answer)- Matt Angell-Business Administrator- Yes, that is correct.

Moderator asked for any other questions or discussion on Article 7. Seeing none, the article will go on the ballot as printed.

Mr. Broderick (School Board member)- said, Mr. Moderator, I make a Motion to restrict reconsideration of Article 7, seconded by Ms. Ingham.

The Moderator asked if there was any further discussion? All in favor, "Aye, opposed? The "aye's carry and Article 7 will not be reconsidered.

Moderator read Article 8.

Article 8.- Capital Reserve Fund-Unanticipated Educational Expenses

Article 8- Shall the Sanborn Regional School District Vote to raise and appropriate up to Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$50,000) to be placed in the Capital Reserve Fund-Unanticipated Educational Expenses established at the 2019 Annual Meeting. This sum to come from June 30 fund balance available for transfer on July 1 instead of returning the money to the community. No amount to be raised from taxation.

Recommended by the Budget Committee In Favor: 8 Opposed: 0

Recommended by the Sanborn Regional School Board In Favor: 6 Opposed: 0

Estimated Tax Impact: Kingston: \$0.00 /\$1,000 Newton: \$0.00 /\$1,000

Jamie Fitzpatrick (School Board member)- This article is to expand the reserve fund for unanticipated education expenses. You know, basically we need sufficient reserves to manage through periods when unexpected events occur The taxpayers have been very generous in the past with supporting the building up of reserves which were previously unacceptably low, this this warrant would take their reserve for this item from about two hundred

thousand dollars to about two hundred fifty thousand dollars and then the same comments about the tax it's zero tax because it's currently going to be coming out of unexpected funds and those have already been created by taxes. So, no new taxes are being created and it's a pretty de minimis number if you determine how much you'd reduce the taxes, you're talking three to four cents depending on per thousand, depending on whether you're from Newton or Kingston.

The Moderator asked for questions or discussion on Article 8. Seeing there are none, this Article 8 will go on the ballot as presented.

Mr. Broderick (School Board member)- said, Mr. Moderator, I make a Motion to restrict reconsideration of Article 8, seconded by Ms. Ingham.

The Moderator asked if there was any further discussion? All in favor, “Aye, opposed? The “aye’s carry and we will not reconsider Article 8.

Moderator read Article 9.

Article 9- Capital Reserve Fund-Capital Improvement and Maintenance

Article 9- Shall the Sanborn Regional School District Vote to raise and appropriate up to Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$50,000) to be placed in the Capital Improvement and Maintenance Capital Reserve Fund previously established. This sum to come from June 30 fund balance available for transfer on July 1 instead of returning the money to the community to offset taxes. No amount to be raised from taxation.

Recommended by the Budget Committee In Favor: 8 Opposed: 0

Recommended by the Sanborn Regional School Board In Favor: 7 Opposed: 0

Estimated Tax Impact Kingston: \$0.00 /\$1,000 Newton: \$0.00 /\$1,000

Jamie Fitzpatrick (School Board member)- the same comments basically as warrant article 8. On this particular fund, the capital reserve fund, capital improvement maintenance would go up another \$50,000. If all three of these reserve trust warrant articles pass, we would add \$175,000 in reserves to the \$915,000 we have in reserves now, to get us a total of a million 90 which is 2.9% of the budget. When you add the revenues coming in from the SLC, from the rental of the old middle school, it would get us to approximately 3.2% of the budget. 3% was the number that we've been

targeting, saying at a minimum, we need about 3% in reserves. So, this would go a long way towards helping us get to the reserves also from the capital improvement, capital

maintenance fund. We can use these reserves and start factoring this into the capital improvement plan as we are developing that plan and spending it in conjunction with these reserves that we're creating for the plan by getting us to where we need to be it'll help us to get reserves where we need them and to allow tighter budgeting and better. The would be \$325,000, it's an additional fifty thousand.

The Moderator asked for any questions or comments on Article 9.

Elizabeth Beebe (Kingston)- my only question for this is on articles 7, 8, and 9. Do we have a priority on those, if the capital fund, if there's not enough to cover all three? How do we distribute the funds?

(Answer)- Matt Angell-Business Administrator- Currently with revenues that are coming in right now, just the surplus revenues alone are going to fund these three priorities. They're in order by priority.

Mr. Broderick (School Board member)- commented that a good way of looking at it is by the vote and let the people decide, based on what they want, in terms of priority.

The Moderator asked for any further questions or comments on Article 9. Seeing there are none, article 9 will go on the ballot as presented.

Mr. Broderick (School Board member)- said, Mr. Moderator, I make a Motion to restrict reconsideration of Article 9, seconded by Ms. Ingham.

The Moderator asked if there was any further discussion on Article 9? All in favor, "Aye, opposed? The "aye's carry and we will not reconsider Article 9.

The Moderator said we are at the end of our list of the warrant and so at this point, there is a very brief opportunity for a topic of non-binding interest that someone in the voters wants to bring up, this would be the moment for that. Other than that, we are going to be looking for a Motion to recess our meeting until the second session when all vote at the polls on election day.

Ms. Gannon-Budget Committee-I would like to thank any of our school board members, well those who are continuing to serve, thank you for your service and those who are outgoing also thank you for your service. I know that this is a big sacrifice to families. These people put a lot of work and a lot of hours into helping to run this school district so I just want to say thank you and good luck.

The Moderator asked for a Motion to conclude our meeting today, moved by Mr. McCarthy and seconded by Ms. Collyer. All in favor? Opposed? The “ayes’ have it.
Meeting adjourned at 8:08 PM.

Respectfully Submitted by:

Phyllis Kennedy - District Clerk